

**ATTACHMENT I (AAA-ENP-1720 RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
ADDENDUM ONE)**

Question 1: I received notice of the ENP RFP and upon review, I have a quick question that I hope you can clarify. I read that proposals should only be submitted to Programs that are currently providing current/existing Congregate Meal sites and Home Delivered Meals. When looking at Appendix Q which lists the C-1 and C-2 sites, there are no current services/sites in the San Fernando Valley Region. If we are an organization wishing to serve the San Fernando Valley, are we not eligible to apply?

Answer 1: Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), Exhibit 2 (Title III C-1 Program Services Fiscal Year Projected Meals Service Delivery Data) revised as of December 14, 2016 reflects services within the San Fernando Valley Region at Las Palmas Park and Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), Exhibit 3 (Title III C-2 and Title III B Program Services Fiscal Year Projected Services Delivery Data) revised as of December 14, 2016 reflects services within San Fernando Valley Region for zip code 91340. Additionally, as reflected in the RFP, Subparagraph 1.4 (Los Angeles County Regions), the San Gabriel Valley Region includes the San Fernando Valley Region and as such an organization that intends to submit a proposal to provide services for San Fernando Valley Region must submit a proposal for the San Gabriel Valley. Further clarification on this requirement will be provided as an addendum to the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.2 (Provide ENP Services for a Full Region).

Question 2: In Service Area “East Gateway Cities” for C-2 – Home Delivered Meals – it includes the City of Norwalk but without additional meal allocations for this region. Currently we are at maximum capacity for meals served. Would additional meals be allotted for this service area? Or was this an error putting the City of Norwalk in the “East Gateway Cities” for C-2. C-1 does not include the City of Norwalk.

Answer 2: The City of Norwalk (zip code 90650) will be revised to be included in the East Gateway Cities Region as an addendum to the RFP, which will include the projected C1 and C2 meals and the unduplicated client counts (refer to Addendum One, Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), revised as of December 14, 2016).

Question 3: Could you please send us or tell us how to download the bid for elderly nutrition services Bid number AAA-ENP-1720-1

Answer 3: The AAA-ENP-1720 RFP may be obtained as follows:

- Access the following website: <http://css.lacounty.gov>
- On the Home page, the Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS, click “Go”

- On the Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS page, click “Request for Proposals (RFP)”
- On the Business Opportunities page, click “View” next to the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP

Question 4: Will all the required forms be issued as either Word or Excel? Some are and some are not; i.e., Appendix D.

Answer 4: All of the Appendix D (Required Forms and Documentation), Part I (Required Forms) forms revised as of December 14, 2016 to be completed and submitted with the proposal have been formatted as either PDF fillable forms or Excel files only.

Question 5: We received a notification of Solicitation #AAA-ENP-1720-2 “Elderly Nutrition Program”, but we cannot locate the actual bid documents. Is this something you could email me by chance, or send me a link for download?

Answer 5: The AAA-ENP-1720 RFP may be obtained as follows:

- Access the following website: <http://css.lacounty.gov>
- On the Home page, the Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS, click “Go”
- On the Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS page, click “Request for Proposals (RFP)”
- On the Business Opportunities page, click “View” next to the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP

Question 6: I believe it was a mistake, but Artesia and Lynwood are not included in the HDM list at all. Currently Lynwood and Artesia are served by **Agency ABC** in the Mid Cities Region.

Answer 6: The City of Artesia (zip code 90701) will be revised to be included in the Mid Gateway Cities Region and the City of Lynwood (zip code 90262) will be revised to be included in the West Gateway Cities Region as an addendum to the RFP (refer to Addendum One, Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), revised as of December 14, 2016).

Question 7: The region chart for congregate meals includes Artesia in the West Gateway Cities. Artesia is currently served by **Agency ABC** in the Mid Cities Region. Is a correction needed?

Answer 7: The City of Artesia (zip code 90701) will be revised to be included in the Mid Gateway Cities as an addendum to the RFP (refer to Addendum One, Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), revised as of December 14, 2016).

Question 8: The 90201 zip code is included in the West Gateway Region for HDM. 90201 includes several cities and Bell Gardens is served by **Agency**

ABC, and the rest served by West Gateway current provider. I believe this a mistake?

Answer 8: The 90201 zip code including the cities of Bell, Bell Gardens, and Cudahy are within the West Gateway Cities Region.

Question 9: **Subcontractor XYZ** is currently a sub-contractor to **Agency ABC** for C-2 home delivered meals programs in the City of Santa Monica and City of Malibu. In reviewing Appendix Q the City of Santa Monica, City of Malibu are not listed. Is the **Agency ABC** contract up for bid? Does this RFP cover the areas **Agency ABC** serves or sub-contract to? I am not familiar with the LA County RFP process and would like to learn more.

A further clarification is that currently we only receive reimbursement from **Agency ABC** for C-2 meals delivered in the City of Santa Monica. We deliver meals that may qualify for C-2 reimbursement in the City of Malibu and the LA County portion of Marina del Rey. The clients fit the criteria.

Answer 9: The service areas of the City of Malibu, the City of Santa Monica, and the Los Angeles County portion of Marina del Rey are within the Westside Cities Region boundary. Proposers interested in serving that area must serve the entire Westside Cities Region. Otherwise, if an agency is interested in providing a specific service within a region, the agency may subcontract with another proposer covering the entire Westside Cities Region.

Question 10: On the RFP website there is a revised Appendix D, required forms? Is this for the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP?

Answer 10: The document entitled "Appendix D, Required Forms – REVISED" which was posted on the website on 11/09/2016 is not for the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP.

Question 11: Is Central LA Region part of this RFP? In APPENDIX Q (SERVICE DELIVERY DATA) EXHIBIT 1 (COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES REGIONS), Central LA Region is on the map, however, it is not included in APPENDIX Q (SERVICE DELIVERY DATA) EXHIBIT 2 (FY 2017-18 PROJECTED TITLE III C-1 PROGRAM SERVICES).

Answer 11: In accordance with the RFP, Subparagraph 1.4 (Los Angeles County Regions), the services for the West Gateway Cities Region will include services for the Central Los Angeles Region. Additional clarification will be provided as an addendum to the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.2 (Provide ENP Services for a Full Region), please.

Question 12: In applying for any region, is the proposer required to serve the entire region (SECTION F, COMMENCEMENT OF PROGRAM SERVICES)?

Attachment I (AAA-ENP-1720 RFP Questions and Answers Addendum One)

Answer 12: In accordance with the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.2 (Provide ENP Services for a Full Region) and the RFP Subparagraph 3.2.6 (Commencement of Program Services), yes, Proposer shall serve the full Region, please.

Question 13: RFP page 46, 7.8.5 - Do the tabs have to be labeled? Such as Section A, Section B, etc.

Answer 13: Yes, please kindly ensure that each tab is labeled in order to identify the Section/Subsection.

Question 14: The cells are locked on Appendix D, Exhibit 27 – Proposed Program Services for Title III – C-2 program on the second page of the form.

Answer 14: Some of the forms provided in Appendix D (Required Forms and Documentation) are being updated and will be posted as part of an addendum, please.

Question 15: Would you please tell me whether or not the Subsections of the proposal need to be tabbed? I.e., on page 47 Method 2 where it describes the method for subsections, can I insert pages at the beginning of the subsections or must these be introduced with tabs?

Answer 15: In accordance with the RFP, Subparagraph 7.8.5, each Section of the proposal shall be tabbed, please. As such, it's not required for you to tab the Subsection unless you elect to do so, please. And yes, you may insert pages at the beginning of the Subsections in order to identify those responses in the proposal. Kindly feel free to follow-up if you have any further questions, please.

Question 16: Will you please forward the information and original email regarding the mandatory ENP Proposer's Conference. I was looking for the details in my email and not sure if I received it.

Answer 16: On November 3, 2016, Workforce Development, Aging and Community Services ("WDACS") notified all interested parties about the release of the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP through an e-mail communication. Kindly note that WDACS did not send an e-mail specifically addressing the Mandatory Proposers' Conference but rather the information pertaining to the Mandatory Proposers' Conference is provided in the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP. You may access this RFP as follows:

- Access the following website: <http://css.lacounty.gov>
- On the 'Home' page, look for 'Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS' and click "Go"
- On the 'Business Opportunities with CSS/Doing Business with CSS page' click "Request for Proposals (RFP)"
- On the 'Business Opportunities page' click "View" next to the AAA-ENP-1720 RFP

Question 17: Under subsection 7.9.1.11.2.1 on page 64 of the RFP, where it says, "For each document, place a tabbed sheet in front of it to identify the document", does that mean that each individual exhibit needs to be tabbed?

Answer 17: Yes, please tab each such document.

Question 18: If so, does the tab have to be labeled as such, e.g., Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2 etc. or can it be something in the manner of a blank page flag as long as the specific Exhibit is noted on each appropriate page of the exhibit itself?

Answer 18: Kindly label the tab using the name/title of the document (the name/title may be abbreviated as needed), please.

Question 19: It appears that Exhibit 21 (Proposed List of Lower Tier Subawards) is titled "Exhibit 32". Is that correct? If so, will the form be updated or should we include the form as is and simply relabel it Exhibit 21? Please advise.

Answer 19: Yes please, you are correct in noting that there was an error on Exhibit 21 (Proposed List of Lower Tier Subawards) which was incorrectly titled as Exhibit 32 (Proposed List of Lower Tier Subawards). There are other forms in Appendix D (Required Forms and Documentation), Part I (Required Forms) that are being revised in addition to this form. These revised forms will be included as an addendum to the RFP once these forms are finalized, please.

Question 20: **Agency ABC** is officially asking for WDACS to revisit the decision to place Lynwood and Bell Gardens in the West Region contrary to the original appendix Q. We believe that these two cities belong in the mid cities region.

Answer 20: As stated during the Mandatory Proposers' Conference on Friday, November 18, 2016, WDACS is in the process of revising the documents which are included as part of Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data). When the revisions are finalized, the updated Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) will be released to all who attended the Mandatory Proposers' Conference, please.

Question 21(A): We are located in the San Fernando Valley and currently have a counterpart City of LA DOA service contract for Nutrition services (C1 and C2), but we don't have any similar partnerships with the County. We did however notice that the current service units in the San Fernando Valley is modest at 6,709 hot meals. Can you please provide some explanation or rationale as to why this large region has such low participation stats within the current County ENP program? Is it that the

majority of eligible seniors are already covered by the City DOA agreement?

Answer 21(A): The San Fernando Valley Region service area is for the Los Angeles County, excluding the City of LA. As a result, the projected service units (C1 and C2) are exclusive to eligible Clients attending the Los Angeles County site at Las Palmas Park (C1) or reside in zip code 91340 (C2).

Question 21(B): Is it that the majority of eligible seniors are already covered by the City DOA agreement?

Answer 21(B): Yes, it is possible that the majority of the eligible individuals are served by City of L.A. DOA.

Question 22(A): Second question is where can we obtain a listing of current incumbent providers for the San Gabriel / San Fernando Valley regions, as well as all other regions, so we can see who is presently servicing them.

Answer 22(A): For the current ENP contracts ("subawards"), WDACS did not use the Regional method to define service areas and as such the current subawards are not designated by Regions. To obtain a list of the current incumbent providers who are serving the areas for which ENP Services are being solicited through this RFP, please prepare a written request specifying the information you'd like to receive and submit your request to Ms. Tsotso Odamtten and copy the AAA RFP mailbox using the following e-mail addresses: todamtten@css.lacounty.gov and aaarfp@css.lacounty.gov. Ms. Odamtten will make arrangements to provide this information to you.

Question 22(B): Are we able to view a copy of the current service agreement contract for these two regions somewhere within the County web portal, similar to the city's web site for public contracts, so we can get an idea of how many dollars are budgeted for how many units of service and some of the contract language terms (understand that the new RFP contract may be revised possible)?

Answer 22(B): At this time, the current subawards are not publically available online. However, kindly note that these subawards were developed using a template that is substantially similar to the RFP, Appendix A (Sample Subaward). To view a copy of the current subaward(s) for the service area that includes San Gabriel Valley and San Fernando Valley, please prepare a written request specifying the information you'd like to receive and submit your request to Ms. Tsotso Odamtten and copy the AAA RFP mailbox using the following e-mail addresses: todamtten@css.lacounty.gov and aaarfp@css.lacounty.gov. Ms. Odamtten will make arrangements to provide you an electronic copy of these documents.

Question 23: Sounds like WDACS is looking for one vendor/organization per Region so you'll select eight organizations. Is that correct?

Answer 23: Yes, that's correct. While WDACS is seeking to select one (1) Proposer per Region, a vendor may submit a proposal for more than one (1) Region.

Question 24: You mentioned about subcontracting. Is there information in the proposal [RFP] if we're interested in doing something like that?

Answer 24: Yes, WDACS allows subcontracting as part of this RFP. Refer to the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.7 (Collaboration Efforts with Lower Tier Subrecipient(s)) and Appendix A (Sample Subaward), Subparagraph 8.40 (Lower Tier Subaward) for information pertaining to subcontracting.

Question 25(A): If there's an existing contractor in that Region then we would have to use the same Congregate sites that are currently being served. I remember four (4) years ago or so you were able to select some other Congregate Meal sites to add to your proposal. If you have someone in the Region they are serving, do you have to put that in your RFP to compete with them in order to serve the same Congregate Meal sites?

Answer 25(A): In accordance with the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.3.4, proposals shall only be submitted to provide Program Services for current/existing Congregate Meal sites and for Home-Delivered Meal Clients on current/existing route. The list of sites and routes has been established for each Region and as such, Proposers who submit proposals for the same Region are requesting to serve these pre-established sites and routes.

Question 25(B): You can't add to that?

Answer 25(B): In accordance with the RFP, Subparagraph 1.5.3.4, due to the limited amount of available funding, proposals shall only be submitted to provide Program Services for current/existing Congregate Meal sites and for Home-Delivered Meal Clients on current/existing routes. As such, funding is not available for Proposers who are interested in providing Program Services to a new Congregate Meal site and/or Home-Delivered Meal route.

Question 26(A): I'm looking for a detailed description of defining the cities in different Regions. Number 1, Norwalk was moved/would be moved from the current provider to another provider; Lynwood would be moved from the current provider to another provider; and Bell Gardens would be moved from the current provider to another provider in a different Region. I'm looking for a detailed explanation of why those cities are being moved from one current provider to a new Region which is currently another provider. A lot of those cities have been served by the same provider and I know this is a new RFP so it's new but some of those cities have been served by a provider for thirty (30) years. And zip codes versus cities, we serve cities that happen to have zip codes. So the people we deal with in those Regions are cities not zip codes. So lumping three (3)

cities in one zip code in one Region doesn't exactly work. So I'm looking for a detailed explanation of moving cities from Region to Region.

Answer 26(A): Based on the information provided in the RFP, WDACS has designated the County into eight (8) Regions and these Regions are not intended to align with the current delivery of Service by existing providers. Each Region contains cities (i.e., Regions are made up of cities) and these cities receive Services (i.e., Services align with cities). When a city falls within the geographic boundaries of the Region then Services provided within that city are assigned to that Region. As such, the City of Norwalk and its respective Services are part of the East Gateway Cities Region; and, the City of Lynwood and City of Bell Gardens and their respective Services are part of the West Gateway Cities Region. WDACS is revising Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) to ensure that Services, cities and Regional data are in alignment.

Question 26(B): Your answers to some of those questions do not align with that. Currently in Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), I'll use Lynwood as an example, Lynwood is listed in Mid Cities Region for C-1 and Lynwood is listed in the West Region for C-2. But then your answer to that question is that you're moving all of Lynwood into the West Region which isn't currently provided by....that would move it to another....

Answer 26(B): WDACS made an error in reflecting C-1 Program Services for Lynwood in the Mid Cities Region. Even though those Services are currently provided by another agency, during this procurement Services will align with the geographic location of the city that will receive those Services. WDACS is revising Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) to ensure that Services, cities and Regional data are in alignment.

Question 26(C): In Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data), it just seems odd that the Home-Delivered and Congregate would be split.

Answer 26(C): WDACS made an error in reflecting C-1 Program Services for Lynwood in the Mid Cities Region and C-2 Program Services in West Gateway Cities Region. WDACS is revising Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) to ensure that Services, cities and Regional data are in alignment.

Question 27(A): We've been all waiting for this RFP very patiently and as a feedback a five-week turnaround is not really fair. It's a horrible time for us, it's a busy time for all of us during the holidays, it's just really busy so a five-week turnaround when we've been waiting for months and months for this RFP ... from November 3rd to December 9th we think it's unfair from a staff perspective.

Answer 27(A): The due date to submit proposals has been revised to Friday, January 20, by 12:00 p.m.

Question 27(B): Our agency covers several of the areas not too much overlap but some overlap so is the County going to provide some kind of PR group

because we're not dealing with moving furniture around we're moving seniors around (moving in the sense of providing different services to different areas) so are we going to work with cities as we transition (either we leave some cities or gain some cities based on the areas of service), are we prepared for that transition in regards to doing that PR work because we have to obviously have conversations with the cities and the seniors so that human side of the change...how do we work together to make that transition amicable for all of us because at the end of the day we all value working with seniors and obviously one of our cities that we would be losing most likely is Norwalk and it's one of our very strong cities that we have and how that transition happens? Our agency has had that city for many years and I know we have a strong relationship with them so we're just looking forward to how that's going to happen in this process, we're either going to lose some cities or gain some ... we're concerned how that's going to look like. And as we receive calls from the Supervisor's office or representatives I want to see how we're all going to collaborate to deal with that because once the Supervisor's office calls it's like we all wake up and it's all answer the question and I want to be proactive how we're going to deal with those circumstances.

Answer 27(B): WDACS will coordinate and work with current and new subrecipients to ensure a smooth transition including outreaching to older individuals, transferring client records (physically and electronically), and transferring equipment purchased with Subaward funds. This transition process will occur once new subrecipient(s) is granted a Subaward.

Question 27(C): With regard to the City of Lynwood, we're very happy to work with **Agency ABC** but the new service area actually belongs to us as a provider so we're not looking to take away that city; we understand the Region and when that happens and we're not here to have that conversation but I want that as feedback to the provider that spoke earlier for me because it's a valid concern from the same perspective we're happy with that provider and how does that look as we transition them out potentially or a different agency gaining them. So I'm just concerned from the human side of the changes and ...there's a Westside area that we also subcontract with and how does that look for transition purposes for our agency.

Answer 27(C): WDACS will coordinate and work with current and new subrecipients to ensure a smooth transition including outreaching to older individuals, transferring client records (physically and electronically), and transferring equipment purchased with Subaward funds. This transition process will occur once new subrecipient(s) is granted a Subaward.

Question 27(D): Financials speaking, did we cover when the financial aspect of the RFP ...is a requirement for this process? I understand that it's a heavy part of this current process for the agencies like the background and the

financials of each agency, how heavily is that going to be a part of this process? That's a very important question in regards to how the point system or how much percentage... is that going to have a weight in regards to the overall process?

Answer 27(D): Financial capability is part of the MMQ and it will be reviewed as part of the initial pass/fail determination. WDACS will review Proposer's financial data, quantify that data using ratios and will analyze it in conjunction with County of Los Angeles Auditor-Controller. Based on the final analysis, WDACS will determine whether Proposer receives a pass/fail for this component of the proposal.

Question 27(E): I know that the boundaries are set ... will there be any potential room for considering let's say one agency wants to keep a certain provider?

Answer 27(E): No because that would result in changing the boundaries of the Regions which are set. This is a new RFP cycle and it must be conducted as an open and fair competitive solicitation. Even though an agency is a current provider that provides services to a city this doesn't mean that this agency will continue to provide services to that city under this solicitation. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors is aware of WDACS' approach to use Regions for this procurement. These Regional boundaries are generally in alignment with the Workforce Development boundaries.

Question 27(F): So the opposite side of that is that if we as a provider will be awarded this agreement we also couldn't say that we don't want to serve that city (in the spirit of working with a different agency); that's not a choice either?

Answer 27(F): If your agency is granted a Subaward, your agency would not work with another agency because your agency would be the one providing Services in that Region.

Question 27(G): One of the cities that we do have and we wouldn't want to keep them, we have to keep the whole Region not just that city, correct?

Answer 27(G): If your agency is granted a Subaward, your agency would be responsible for providing Services to the full Region (not a partial Region). This includes providing Services to every meal site and route within that Region.

Question 28: Follow-up question to Appendix Q, Appendix Q was approved by the Board of Supervisors. You've subsequently moved five (5) cities from that approved list to different Regions. **[WDACS]** said Appendix Q was approved by the Board of Supervisors. Lynwood was in Mid Cities and Bell Gardens was in Mid Cities in the Appendix. Your answers to the questions now have moved those to different Regions from what was approved by the Board.

Answer 28: Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) was not approved by the Board of Supervisors. WDACS informed the Board of Supervisors of the Regional concept that is used for this procurement. Some of the revisions being made to Service delivery data are in congruence with the map to ensure that the geographical location of a site is consistent with the Regional boundary; errors were made which are now being corrected. The procurement process is still ongoing; once successful Proposers have been selected by WDACS, recommendations are made to the Board of Supervisors who have final authority to approve the final Subaward.

Question 29: If a provider applies for two (2) different Regions and they're awarded both Regions, will it be two (2) separate contracts or just one (1) contract?

Answer 29: In this scenario, the provider will be awarded two (2) separate Subawards, one (1) for each Region (i.e., each Region will have its own Subward).

Question 30: I'm wondering about the timeframe. We have until December 23rd, there's an evaluation process, then it goes to the Board. What is the timeframe for the contract to be awarded?

Answer 30: The dates reflected in the RFP, Subparagraph 7.3 (RFP Timeline) will be revised and this information will be reflected in an addendum. WDACS tentatively estimates that successful Proposers will be notified as to whether or not they have been selected to receive a Subaward in or around March 2017.

Question 31(A): All of the updates that will be to Exhibits 1, 7, 21, 26... and to Appendix Q, all of these updates, when should we see the addendums on those?

Answer 31(A): WDACS will release an addendum when these updates are finalized. Appendix A is finalized and will be released with the first addendum. Updates to some of the documents in Appendix D are finalized but others are pending; as such, Appendix D will be released once all necessary documents are finalized.

Question 31(B): But there are several things that need to be changed so we're going to get them as you finalize them?

Answer 31(B): WDACS will release an addendum when these updates are finalized. Additionally, as each addendum is released, interested parties will have an opportunity to ask questions as it relates specifically to that addendum. Questions pertaining to the RFP that was released on Friday, November 3, 2016 were due by Friday, November 18, 2016 and that due date has elapsed. As such, in order to ensure that the RFP process is conducted in a manner that is competitive, fair and impartial to all interested parties, WDACS is not at liberty to address questions

pertaining to that document, please. CSS will provide periodic updates to all interested parties as needed.

Question 31(C): It sounded like Appendix Q still has lots of questions so how long will it take?

Answer 31(C): As soon as Appendix Q (Service Delivery Data) is finalized, WDACS will release that information through an addendum.